UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,710	11/07/2000	Jeffrey A. Korn	1029-0100	9810

25263 7590 02/28/2005

J GRANT HOUSTON
AXSUN TECHNOLOGIES INC
1 FORTUNE DRIVE
BILLERICA, MA 01821

EXAMINER	
WANG, GEORGE Y	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2871	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/707,710
Filing Date: November 07, 2000
Appellant(s): KORN ET AL.

MAILED
FEB 2 8 2005
GROUP 2600

J. Grant Houston
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 3, 2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct. However, it is noted that Appellant has labeled this section, rather, as "Summary of Claimed Subject Matter."

(6) Issues

Appellant's has failed to include a statement of the issues in the brief.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The rejection of claims 6-8 and 10-19 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

4,673,244	MILES	6-1987
6,340,831	KUHARA	1-2002
6,345,059	FLANDERS	2-2002

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 6-8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on May 18, 2004. For convenience, the Final Rejection is set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 6-8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miles (U.S. Patent No. 4,673,244) in view of Kuhara et al. (6,340,831, from hereinafter "Kuhara"), and in further view of Flanders (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,059).

3. As to claims 6-8, 10, 12-13, and 16-19, Miles discloses a process for manufacturing a semiconductor laser that requires installing the chip (fig. 4, ref. 120) in a package, inserting and securing a polarization-maintaining optical fiber through the ferrule and feedthrough (col. 3, lines 41-43), aligning the endface to the energized semiconductor chip (col. 4, lines 4-6) and detecting the polarization extinction ratio (PER) of light transmitted through the fiber from the semiconductor chip (fig. 3), and then axially rotating the enface of the fiber to maximize the PER through detection on a

slow or fast path or axis (fig. 3). Miles also teaches a process of securing the fiber on the mounting structure by sealing around the fiber, before or after axial rotation adjustments (col. 5, lines 39-51). Miles also teaches the use of a mounting structure to improve the PER (fig. 3).

However, Miles fails to specifically disclose installing a semiconductor chip in a package on a bench and securing an endface of the optical fiber to the bench and the reference also does not specifically teach a mounting structure that is deformable.

Kuhara discloses semiconductor laser (fig. 18, ref. 70) with a semiconductor chip (col. 15, lines 61-66) on a bench (fig. 18, ref. 98) and securing an endface of the optical fiber (fig. 18, ref. 91) to the bench (col. 16, lines 1-2).

Flanders discloses a semiconductor laser (abstract) having a deformable mounting structure (col. 4, lines 41-44) that enables active and passive alignment during system manufacture or calibration after an in-service period (col. 4, lines 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have installed a semiconductor chip in a package on a bench and securing an endface of the optical fiber to the bench since one would be motivated to create a laser that is smaller in size and subsequently cheaper to manufacture (col. 16, lines 5-9). Moreover, such a method produces a device that is more suitable for long distance communication (col. 6, lines 33-35), has lower optical loss (col. 6, lines 35-38), and has easier handling for optical transmission (col. 8, lines 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a deformable mounting structure since one would be

motivated to further maximize PER during the process of manufacture of the semiconductor laser device (col. 4, lines 41-44). A deforming structure allows fibers that are already aligned and secured to be readjusted so that PER can be enhanced until a desired ratio level is reached (col. 4, lines 41-44). And this is important because, according to Miles, the level of optimally desired PER relates directly to the quality of the laser light that will emerge from the fiber. If the PER is optimized, even when the fiber is shortened, the light that is outputted will be high quality, linearly polarized light that is independent of fiber length and is therefore, highly useful for designed application (col. 5, lines 52-62).

4. As to claims 11, 14, and 15, Miles discloses a process for manufacturing a semiconductor laser as recited above, however, the reference fails to specifically disclose plastically deforming a mounting structure to which the fiber endface is secured and where axial fiber rotation and PER maximization can be performed (fig. 3).

Flanders discloses a semiconductor laser (abstract) having a deformable mounting structure (col. 4, lines 41-44) that enables active and passive alignment during system manufacture or calibration after an in-service period (col. 4, lines 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a deformable mounting structure since one would be motivated to further maximize PER during the process of manufacture of the semiconductor laser device (col. 4, lines 41-44). A deforming structure allows fibers that are already aligned and secured to be readjusted so that PER can be enhanced

until a desired ratio level is reached (col. 4, lines 41-44). And this is important because, according to Miles, the level of optimally desired PER relates directly to the quality of the laser light that will emerge from the fiber. If the PER is optimized, even when the fiber is shortened, the light that is outputted will be high quality, linearly polarized light that is independent of fiber length and is therefore, highly useful for designed application (col. 5, lines 52-62).

(11) Response to Argument

Appellant main argument is that none of the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the step of Appellants' Claim 6 of "axially rotating the endface of the fiber relative to the bench to improve the polarization extinction ratio by deforming the mounting structure" performed after the step of "securing an endface of the optical finber to the bench to receive light generated by the semiconductor chip using a mounting structure." In particular, Appellant argues that the Miles Patent "teaches away" from the invention claimed by Appellants in Claim 6.

Appellant argues that each of the references in the combination proposed in the Office Action "teaches away" from their combination. However, Examiner disagrees and will address the arguments to each of the references below.

As to the Miles reference, Appellant argues that "after the bonding is set, the fiber is not longer adjusted" and therefore presumes that "in some sense, the Miles Patent teaches away from the invention as claimed." While Examiner agrees that after the bonding is set, the fiber is no longer adjusted, Examiner asserts that nowhere is this

found in the claims. In fact, there is no mention of any type of bonding. The claims merely recited the step of "securing" an endface of the fiber to bench and then "after the step of securing" is the PER detected. Because neither the language of the claims nor the specification teach about any type of bonding, Examiner sees no reason how the Miles references teaches away. The Miles reference clearly discloses inserting and securing a polarization-maintaining optical fiber through the ferrule and feedthrough (col. 3, lines 41-51), aligning the endface to the energized semiconductor chip (col. 4, lines 4-6) and detecting the polarization extinction ratio (PER) of light transmitted through the fiber from the semiconductor chip (fig. 3), and then axially rotating the enface of the fiber to maximize the PER through detection on a slow or fast path or axis (fig. 3, note the feedback loop to "rotate fiber"). Because the claims did not recite anything having to do with bonding, Examiner interpreted "the fiber end is placed in the ferrule...that the center of the fiber and the ferrule coincide as nearly as possible, so that the movement of the fiber off center when the fiber is rotated is as small as possible" as reading on the claim language "securing." In fact, like that of Appellant's invention, the Miles references teaches that even placing, or securing, the fiber in this manner "permits rotating and otherwise manipulating the fiber with lessened risk of distorting or damaging the fiber" (col. 3, lines 48-51). Therefore, just as Appellant admits, the Miles reference and Appellant's invention "both seek to improve rotation alignment between a fiber secured on a mount structure and a laser." As a result, Examiner does not believe that the Miles references teaches away from the claimed invention.

As to the Flanders reference, Appellant argues that the reference "does not contain any mentioning of polarization extinction ratio" (PER) nor does it show axial rotation of the fiber endface by a deforming structure. However, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes that the Flanders reference was combined with the Miles reference to render obvious the use of a deformable mounting structure, and not for PER detection or the like. The reason is because the Miles reference, as discussed above, already teaches these elements. Clearly, the Flanders reference is of the same semiconductor art and so the only reason to combine the Flanders reference is to provide the use of deformable mounting structure. The Flanders reference clearly teaches the use of a deformable mounting structure (col. 4, lines 41-44) and provides more than sufficient motivation to combine in that it enables active and passive alignment during system manufacture or calibration after an in-service period (col. 4, lines 41-44). Morevoer, this is important because if the PER of Miles is optimized, even when the fiber is shortened, the light that is outputted will be high quality, linearly polarized light that is independent of fiber length and is therefore, highly useful for designed application (col. 5, lines 52-62).

As to the Kuhara reference, Appellant argues that it does not show axially rotating the endface of the fiber relative to a bench to improve the PER by a deforming structure. However, Examiner disagrees. For the same reasons indicated for the use of the Flanders reference, the Kuhara reference is important only for the step of installing a semiconductor chip in a package on a bench and securing an endface of the optical fiber to the bench. Clearly, the Kuhara reference is of the same semiconductor

art and discloses a semiconductor laser (fig. 18, ref. 70) with a semiconductor chip (col. 15, lines 61-66) on a bench (fig. 18, ref. 98) and securing an endface of the optical fiber (fig. 18, ref. 91) to the bench (col. 16, lines 1-2). Moreover, the reference provides more than adequate motivation to combine with the Miles reference to create a laser that is smaller in size and subsequently cheaper to manufacture (col. 16, lines 5-9) and providing that such a method produces a device that is more suitable for long distance communication (col. 6, lines 33-35), has lower optical loss (col. 6, lines 35-38), and has easier handling for optical transmission (col. 8, lines 8-12).

For the above reasons, it is believed that prior art of record is sufficient and valid in their teachings and combination. Therefore, the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

George Y. Wang
February 17, 2005

ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Conferees:

Robert Kim

Olik Chaudhuri O.C.

J GRANT HOUSTON
AXSUN TECHNOLOGIES INC
1 FORTUNE DRIVE
BILLERICA, MA 01821